

## Proposal Evaluation Criteria

### Appropriateness/relevance of the topic

Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Score
Topic is not current or is not appropriate. It does not appear to be a worthwhile session.	Topic is only minimally related to the field, not current or important to the field/ audience. It may not be a worthwhile session.	Topic may not be current or groundbreaking but it is relevant to field and audience. It may be a worthwhile session.	Topic is current, important, and appropriate to the field and audience. It appears to be a worthwhile session.	The topic is cutting-edge, relevant or significant to the field and audience. It appears to be a very worthwhile session.	

### Inclusion of evidence-base or theory

Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Score
The proposal does not mention theory, practice, or research, or it is unclear how this session is connected to the field.	The proposal provides background references to theory, practice and/or research, but the references are not specific or recent, or the proposal does not relate the theory, practice/research to the content.	The proposal refers somewhat to relevant theory, practice, and/or research in an understandable way and relates it to the content.	The proposal refers clearly to the relevant, theory, practice, and/or research in a thorough manner and it relates directly to the content.	The proposal refers specifically to the relevant theory, practice and/or research in a detailed and comprehensible manner and it relates directly to the presentation content.	

### The proposal is completed accurately and clearly and is an indicator of presentation quality.

Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Score
The writing suggests that the presentation may be poor and sections of proposal weren't completed.	The writing suggests that the presentation may be poor and/or the proposal form was not completed accurately.	The proposal is adequately written but suggests that the presentation may be of moderate quality and/or parts of the proposal form are not clearly completed.	The proposal is clearly written and suggests the presentation will be of very good quality and the proposal form was completed accurately.	The proposal is very well written and suggests that the presentation will be of professional quality and the proposal form was completed accurately and clearly.	

### Clear learning objectives and outcomes

Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Score
The length and content are inappropriate for the session type and the delivery goals and/or objectives are not clearly stated.	The proposal content is inappropriate for the session type and the goals/ objectives are to general or broad.	The length, content and delivery methods are generally appropriate for the session. The objectives and participant outcomes are stated but may lack sufficient focus.	The length and content are appropriate for the session type. The objectives and participant outcomes are clear.	The content and length are appropriate for the session. The objectives and participant outcomes are very clear.	

Presenter experience/ability

<b>Poor (1)</b> Presenter did not provide information on past experience or presentations on subject matter.	<b>Fair (2)</b> Presenter has little experience on presenting but not on the presentation subject matter.	<b>Good (3)</b> Presenter has moderate experience presenting but minimal experience on presentation subject matter.	<b>Very Good (4)</b> Presenter has good experience on presenting and on the subject matter.	<b>Excellent (5)</b> Presenter has advanced experience presenting and is considered a subject matter expert.	Score
---	--	--	--	---	-------

The topic is novel, innovative or diverse and/or the presenter(s) contributes to diversity

<b>Poor (1)</b> The topic is old and/or repetitive	<b>Good (3)</b> The topic is newer but is similar to another presentation.	<b>Excellent (5)</b> The topic is original and unique from other submissions.	Score
<b>Poor (1)</b> The presenter(s) are already well-represented in the demographics/experiences of presenters for this event and past events.	<b>Good (3)</b> The presenters(s) contribute some demographic/experiential diversity for the presenter pool of this event.	<b>Excellent (5)</b> The presenters(s) contribute a unique, or a great deal of, demographic/experiential diversity for the presenter pool of this event.	

Potential impact

<b>Low (1)</b>	<b>Medium (3)</b>	<b>High (5)</b>	Score
----------------	-------------------	-----------------	-------

The information provided is useful and usable (is skills-based or research oriented?)

<b>Poor (1)</b> The information is usable or is repetitive.	<b>Good (3)</b> The information is useful and usable but may not be skills-based.	<b>Excellent (5)</b> The information is useful and usable with a basis on skills or research.	Score
--	--	--	-------

Intended audience interest in the topic

<b>Poor (1)</b> No/few people have given feedback requesting this topic.	<b>Good (3)</b> Several people have given feedback requesting a presentation on this topic.	<b>Excellent (5)</b> Many people have given feedback requesting a presentation on this topic	Score
---	--	---	-------